

the level of the base of the canine; posterior palatal vacuities opposite the molars and last two premolars*. Molars small and delicate.

Dimensions of the type (measured by collector in the flesh):—

Head and body 168 millim.; tail 120; hind foot 25; ear 18.

Skull: extreme length 35; greatest breadth 17.8; nasals 16×4.2 ; interorbital breadth 6.3; palate length from hensenion 17.5; breadth at corners of $m.^2$ 10; palatal foramina, length 3.2; combined lengths of $pm.^4$ and $ms.^{1-2}$ ($ms.^{1-3}$ of Catalogue) 5.6.

Hab. Rio Cauqueta, a tributary of the Cauca, near Cali, Colombia. Alt. 1000 m.

Type. Male. B.M. no. 99.9.6.51. Original number 470. Collected August 1897 by J. H. Batty.

This species is evidently a Colombian representative of the Brazilian *M. incana* and the Venezuelan *M. fuscata*, but may be readily distinguished from either of them by the characters above given. The three form a special group characterized by their small brain-cases and long narrow unridged interorbital regions.

XXVIII.—*The Generic Name Thylacomys.*

By EDGAR R. WAITE, F.L.S.

MR. T. S. PALMER's paper "On *Thylacomys*, Owen" †, recalls my note, published the previous year ‡, on the spelling of this name, and on its possibly jeopardizing a term applied by myself to a new genus of Australian rodents §. In this note I mentioned that, not having access to the work in which the name originally occurred—namely, Blyth, in Cuvier's 'Animal Kingdom,' 1840, p. 104,—I had referred to the editions of 1849 (p. 104) and 1863 (p. 92), but there found the spelling to be *Thalacomys*, not *Thylacomys*. As a result of my note I almost expected that some zoologist in London to whom the 1840 edition is available would have cleared up the matter; but I have not seen any further reference to it.

* Accepting the cheek-tooth formula as four premolars and three molars, the third of the premolars being the " $p.^4$ " of the Catalogue, and being the only tooth of the "permanent" series (see Lydekker, P. Z. S. 1898).

† Palmer, Ann. & Mag. Nat. Hist. (7) iv., Oct. 1899, p. 300.

‡ Waite, *loc. cit.* (7) ii., Aug. 1898, p. 196.

§ Waite, Proc. Roy. Soc. Vict. (n. s.) x. 1898, p. 121.

Mr. Palmer, of Washington, writes to establish the name *Thylacomys* in lieu of *Perogale* for the Bielby or Rabbit-Bandicoot, but, like myself, he has not access to the 1840 edition, and quotes as his authority the two editions consulted by me (*vide* his footnote). Mr. Palmer has evidently not seen my note and has failed to perceive that in the editions examined the spelling of the word is *Thalacomys*. Under these circumstances I would request the editors of the 'Annals' to kindly examine the original (1840) edition, and publish the information desired for the benefit of the benighted workers in Washington and Sydney*.

[This case is more difficult of decision than Mr. Waite supposes, for although in the 1840, as well as in the later editions, of his 'Animal Kingdom' Blyth spells the name *Thalacomys*, yet Palmer is, as I have verified, perfectly correct in quoting the first mention of it, in the 'Athenæum' of 1838, as *Thylacomys*, and in the 'Catalogue of Marsupials,' equally anterior to Mr. Waite's rodent *Thylacomys*, it is also spelt in the same way.

This being the case, I hardly think that the name *Thylacomys* could be regarded as a name still valid in 1898 for another genus, even if that form of it be not adopted for the Rabbit-Bandicoot. No doubt the 'Athenæum' reference might be treated as a *nomen nudum* did it stand alone †; but the other references, incorrect as Blyth's was and indirect as was my own, yet together seem to make it impossible that *Thylacomys* should be used elsewhere in zoology.

The following additional note by Mr. Waite is therefore published at his request in case *Thylacomys* were considered invalid for the rodent.—O. THOMAS.]

Inquiry therefore brings out the fact that the form *Thylacomys* has been used. For my present purpose it is of no consequence whether the genus has been sufficiently diagnosed or not. The word has been used in scientific literature, and is therefore not again available in zoology.

In place of *Thylacomys*, Waite, I propose the name *Asco-pharynx*.

Australian Museum, Sydney.
16th November, 1899.

* [In the 1840 edition the name is given as *Thalacomys*, Owen.—Eds.]

† So far as the form to be used is concerned I should do this, calling the Rabbit-Bandicoot *Thalacomys lagotis*.